



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

people do mutter, that the Scriptures are made for all men, and that it is of envy that the priests do keep the holy book from them. . . . No, no; the Church doth it to keep them from blind, ignorant presumption, and from that which the Apostle calleth knowledge, falsely so called; and not to debar them from the true knowledge of Christ."

It was not, therefore, from any desire that the people should be able to read God's Word that the Douay translation was made. It was simply because that was the only way to keep the people from reading the Protestant translations.

Of those translations, the Douay translators say, in this preface—"The Protestants . . . have so abused the people, and many other in the world not unwise, that by their false translations they have, instead of God's law and testament, and for Christ's written will and word, given their own wicked writing and phantasies;" and they also charge them with "adding whole sentences, proper to their sect, into their psalms in metre, even into the very creed in rhyme, all which the poor deceived people say and sing, as though they were God's own Word, being, indeed, through such sacrilegious treachery, made the devil's word." So the poor monk, who was found guilty a few months ago of burning the Authorized Version, as being "the devil's word," was not guilty of an invention of his own, but was only following the Douay translators.

It is true, the Douay translators did not speak in that preface of the present Authorized Version, which was not published, as it now is, until the year 1610. They spoke of the former Protestant translations made before the year 1580.

We shall state in our next number how far the present authorized translation agrees with, and differs from, those former Protestant translations; and we shall continue the history of the Douay translation, and the changes that have since been made in it.

In the meantime, we ask our Roman Catholic readers, who are in the habit of referring to the Douay Bible, when reading our discussions, to observe this fact, that if it had not been for the Protestant translations, they would never have had the Douay translation of the Bible into English—they would never have been able to read a word of the Bible at all. It is clear that only for what is thus indecently called "the Devil's book," their Church would have been well content to leave them for ever without "God's Book." Thus the Protestant translations have done at least this much good, that they have been the means of getting for Roman Catholics the Douay translation of the Scriptures into their own tongue. This, at least, is a merit that should not be denied or forgotten, unless we will say, what we hope none of our readers will say, that it would have been better if the Douay translation itself had never been made, but that all who can speak English only should have been for ever debarred from reading the Word of God.

THE STORY OF ST. EPIPHANIUS AND THE VEIL.

Having had occasion, in another column, page 56, to quote the letter of St. Epiphanius to John of Jerusalem, we give here, according to our promise, an extract, which will explain some of the circumstances which gave rise to the letter. "I heard that some were murmuring against me, for the following reason:—When we were going together, to the holy place, which is called Bethel, that I might there hold a service with you, according to the ecclesiastical custom, and when I had come to the village called Anablatha, I saw, as I was passing by, a light burning there; so I asked what place it was, and, being told that it was a church, I entered in, to pray there; and I found there a veil, hanging on the doors of the same church, dyed and painted, and having the likeness of Christ, I believe, or of some saint or other, for I don't exactly remember whose likeness it was. So, when I saw this—the likeness of a man hanging in the church of Christ, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures—I tore it, and I gave directions to the keepers of the place, to roll up some poor dead person in it, and bury him in it. But they murmured against me, and said, 'If you wished to tear our veil, it would be only right that you should give us another in exchange for it.' So, when I heard this, I acknowledged that it was reasonable, and promised that I would give it, and would send one forthwith. Some delay, however, having taken place, because I was anxious to send a very good veil, instead of it, for I thought I ought to send one from Cyprus [his own diocese]; but now I send the best veil I could find, and I beg you will give directions, to the priests of that place, to take it from bearer, and will give orders that no veils of that kind, which are contrary to our religion, should henceforth be hung up in the church of Christ, for it becomes you to be more careful to take away this cause of offence, which is unworthy of the church of Christ, and of the people who have been committed to you."

We have thought this story worth translating because of the important light which it throws on the practice of the Church towards the end of the fourth century. We have here St. Epiphanius, one of the leading bishops of the time, going into a church, and seeing there an innocent picture of Christ, or of a saint

hanging up. It does not appear that any adoration was being offered to the picture, or that any other abuse was connected with it—the picture was there, that was all. St. Epiphanius does not examine whose picture it was; he considers it contrary to the authority of Scripture to have a picture there at all; he tears it, and orders a dead person to be buried in it. Well, then, the attendants of the church murmur at him. No doubt they do, one might say. No doubt, they say—"You sacrilegious wretch, who have dared to tear this holy picture, do you think we will be partakers in your vile impiety, or that we will employ the likeness of this blessed saint in the mean use you tell us to apply it to." Not so; the attendants of the church say no such thing. They merely say—"Will not your reverence pay us the price of the canvas you have spoiled."

Further, St. Epiphanius has so little notion that he has done anything wrong, that he sends a full account of his performances to a bishop who was not on the best possible terms with him, whom he was himself, in the very same letter, rating sharply for his too great leaning to the Origenist heretics, and who, one would think, would be glad of the opportunity of a counter-charge against Epiphanius. And yet no such charge is made, and St. Epiphanius is not accused of the least irreverence in his conduct, which a present of a new veil amply atones for.

Finally, St. Jerome gets a copy of St. Epiphanius's letter, and in place of discreetly concealing the impiety of his friend, he makes a Latin translation of the letter, and hands down this anecdote of St. Epiphanius to perpetual memory.

Verily, the Catholic Church, at the end of the fourth century, had very different usages from the Church calling itself exclusively Catholic in our day. If St. Epiphanius could now be introduced into a Protestant church and a Roman Catholic chapel, the latter ornamented with handsome paintings of Christ and the Virgin, and, perhaps, other saints—and that not merely for historical use, but bowed down to by the people—which do you think St. Epiphanius would take for the old Church?

DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

NO. II.

Eustachio—The saints of the ancient Church praised virginity and continency to the skies, and were not satisfied with words only. How many holy bishops were there, in fact, who, abstaining from marriage, lived holily in celibacy?

Salviano—Let all due praise be given, then, to virginity. Continency is a great virtue. Tertullian calls it the flower of customs, an honour to the body, the ornament of the sexes, the foundation of holiness, &c. And Cyprian calls chastity the ornament of the noble, the exaltation of the humble, the comfort of the sad, the embellishment of the deformed. Be it so, then; it is true that these holy bishops did not marry, but it is no less true that they did not speak ill of marriage, nor condemn those who were married. On the contrary, the great Bishop of Hippo (St. Augustine) confutes the error of St. Jerome, who had allowed reproachful words to escape him concerning a state ordained by God. And Augustine selects this opportunity to show, in various ways, the utility of marriage. You say that there were many bishops who lived holily in celibacy, and we answer you that we can count up many who lived laudably in matrimony. Spiridion was father of St. Basil, and father-in-law of St. Gregory Nazianzen. In the family of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, the bishopric was preserved, and had descended from father to son for eight turns, as Polycrates himself says, in writing to Victor, Bishop of Rome—"Seven of my ancestors were bishops in succession: I am the eighth." What shall we say, too, of Cherenon, Bishop of Egypt, who, with his aged wife and with many others of the faithful, was driven into exile and died in a mountain of Arabia? Clement, of Alexandria, exclaims concerning this—"Such was the marriage of the blessed." Hilary, a bishop most celebrated for learning and for holiness, had a wife and children, of whom it is written that his family was no damage to him, nor was his wife, who was united to him in lawful marriage, any hindrance to his ministry. Notwithstanding these examples, if a priest or a friar takes a wife, you look upon him as profane, you load him with abuse as the vilest man in the world. It was not so, however, my friend, in the primitive times of the Church of Jesus Christ. I have named to you many persons distinguished for holiness and for doctrine, who lived in lawful marriage. Now, we cannot find anywhere that those who lived in celibacy condemned or defamed those holy persons as you do in these days. But not only were the saints whom I have named hitherto married, but many of your popes themselves were sons of priests and begotten in lawful matrimony. We may instance, amongst many others—Boniface the First, Felix the Third, Agapetus the First, Adrian the Second, Agapetus the Second. Gratian, Platina and others bear witness to this. In fine, are there not many councils who make mention of the wives and children of bishops?

Eustachio—True, indeed; but there are, on the other

hand, many other councils in which the contrary was ordained.

Salviano—You cannot bring forward even one, especially of the four universal and truly catholic councils. The devil, as the enemy of the Divine ordinances, did not fail, it is true, to suggest to many the prohibition of holy matrimony, in order that he might introduce into the Church of Jesus Christ fornications and adulteries. There rose up some in the first Council of Nice who were of opinion that marriage should be forbidden to the clergy; but St. Paphnutius advised the very opposite. Hear what Socrates says on this subject—"Some bishops wished to introduce a new law into the Church, by imposing it upon bishops, priests, and deacons not to live with the wives whom they had taken when they were laymen. Paphnutius, rising up among them, cried out, that 'such a heavy yoke should not be put upon the most holy men, since marriage was honourable in all,' &c. Socrates says that Paphnutius considered chastity to be living with a lawful wife. All the assembly consented to his opinion, and silence was imposed about the controversy, each man being left at liberty to abstain or not from living with his own wife. You may read to this effect Sozomen, Gelasius, Cyzicenus, Nicephorus, Cassiodorus, and others. In the fifth of the Apostolic Canons, these remarkable words are to be found—"A bishop, priest, or deacon shall not put away his wife under pretence of religion. If he sends her away, let him be separated from the communion; and if he perseveres, let him be deposed." Whether these canons be those of the Apostles or not, let those declare who boast of them. The Council of Gangra excommunicates those who condemn married priests, and in the fourth canon expresses itself as follows—"If any one thinks that a married priest cannot, because of his marriage, exercise his ministry, and abstains on this account from communion with him, let him be anathema." Moreover, the Trullan Council, A.D. 692, ordained (contrary to the Church of Rome) that whoever, in spite of the Apostolic Canons, should dare to prohibit commerce or living with a lawful wife, should be excommunicated; and this canon is expressed as well with regard to the clergy as to secular persons.

Eustachio—If the councils just now named by you grant marriage to ecclesiastics, there are, however, many others which are of our opinion, and forbid the clergy to marry and to have children. We may say, then, as it is commonly said—here is altar against altar, council against council: on which are we to pin our faith?

Salviano—You cannot err if you follow the Word of God and the practice of the saints of the Old and New Testaments. Who can ever take away from you that which God granted to the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, and the disciples? Follow the rule of those councils which follow the Word of God. St. Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, says—"The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is that which is declared in the canonical books, against which, if councils ordain anything, it is altogether wicked." But let us have recourse to your own practice. Since there is to be found in some acts of the councils a discordant opinion, we should hold to the sentence of that council the authority of which is the best founded and the most ancient. Do you wish to know, for instance, if images ought to be venerated? If you look to the councils you will find yourself somewhat puzzled—in fact, the Council of Elvira ordains that there should not be pictures in the Church. The Councils of Constantinople ordain the same thing, and the Council of Frankfort desires that images should not be venerated. But then, on the other hand, the second Council of Nice, the Roman and the Trent Councils, desire that images should be venerated. Well, then, it is very easy to know which of these councils have ordained the truth. He who is sincere will follow the first, since they follow in their decrees the Word of God and the practice of the ancient Church. He will do this the rather since, with regard to the matter about which we are in controversy, the councils adopted by your party, in favour of the celibacy of the clergy, are not in general opposed to those adopted by us nor are they in your favour.

Eustachio—What then? Is not the Council of Elvira on our side, which forbids, in one of its canons, the very same thing which our popes now prohibit? Here it is word, for word—"It pleases us altogether to command bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons to abstain from their wives and not to beget children." Can anything be clearer?

Salviano—No, dear friend; this canon is not at all in your favour, if you only quote the whole of it, as it stands in the volumes of the councils—"to bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons, *positis in ministerio*, while they are exercising their ministry." Thence it is clear that it was enjoined by the fathers on the clergy to abstain from their wives only while they were ministering or preparing for sacred duties. This is the true sense of many canons which you think favourable to celibacy. But how, I pray you, can canons of this sort be in your favour? How in the world do these canons forbid marriage to the clergy whilst they actually suppose that they are married already, and only command them to abstain from all commerce with their wives whilst they are preparing for sacred offices? To command the clergy to abstain from their wives when

they were to officiate, is that the same thing as forbidding them to marry? To reason in such a manner is the same as to say—The priests of the Old Testament, when they were to sacrifice or perform any other function in the Temple, were not to come near their wives, therefore they were forbidden to marry. Be candid, my friend. Does not such a mode of reasoning appear to you ridiculous?

Eustachio—This remark of yours is curious. Many obscure things may thus be made clear, by showing the agreement of those canons which seem to disagree. Prove to me now, however, that the council really had this meaning when they ordered the clergy to abstain from their wives, &c.

Salviano—Yes, such was the meaning of various councils, and they cannot be understood otherwise. We must thus understand the second canon of the second Council of Carthage, which is expressed in this manner—“It is pleasing to all that the bishops, priests, and deacons—those, in fine, who administer the sacraments—that they should observe chastity, and abstain, also, from their wives.” To the same effect is the 8th canon of Gratian, which says—“Having heard of the incongruity of some of the clergy, though it be with their own wives, it is decreed that the bishops, priests, and deacons, according to their own statutes, should abstain from their wives.” Therefore, according to these canons the clergy might have wives, provided they abstained from them according to their own statutes. What is the meaning of this? To say the truth, in reading these words—“*Secundum propria statuta*”—I myself did not know well, at first sight, what they meant. I observed, however, that in some canons, instead of the words quoted above, it was written, “*in propriis terminis*.” These canons mean, therefore, that the clergy should abstain from their wives whenever it came to their turn to perform ecclesiastical duties. Balsamo explains the fact so clearly as to take away every difficulty. In the fourth canon of the same council he says—“The synod does not forbid commerce with them except in their own terms—that is, on the days appointed for the turn of each of them.” “*Nisi in propriis terminis—id est, in prestitutis, unus cujusque vicis diebus*.” We may add, also, the Trullan Council, 13th canon, which orders “the sub-deacons, deacons, and priests who administer the sacraments to abstain also from their wives in their own terms, knowing that there is a time for everything, especially for fasting and prayer; therefore, it is suitable for those who assist at the altars when they begin the sacred functions to be continent in all things.”

Eustachio—But does the Greek Church also understand it thus?

Salviano—The Greek Church has better views than the Latin upon this point. To command priests to abstain from their wives when they were to preach the Holy Gospel, or to administer the sacraments, is quite a different thing from taking away their wives by forbidding them to marry according to an express law. The decrees of the above named councils are Catholic and praiseworthy. If, according to the doctrine of St. Paul, the husband should separate from his wife for a time, to give himself to fasting and prayer, why should not the minister leave his wife at the time when he is to fulfil the duties of his ministry? But your ordinances, on the contrary, are opposed to the Word of God, and to the practice of the Church of both testaments, and very far from being truly catholic, they may be considered quite heretical. As they derive their origin, moreover, from the impure sources of the Tatians, Siricians, and other heretics, so they cover all Christendom with impurity. Ah, if your Church had followed the doctrine of Jesus Christ as his pole-star, they would not have struck upon such rocks; they would not have been enchanted by the Siricians and the Callistians, as by so many Syrens; they would not have given up the valuable liberty granted to them by God himself, nor would they in fine, have cast so many snares upon the necks of men to drag them into the most filthy lusts, and thence into eternal perdition.

Eustachio—In saying that our Church has not followed the doctrine of Jesus Christ, nor the practice of the Churches of the Old and New Testaments, you mean to insinuate that the law enacted against the marriage of ecclesiastics is quite a new thing; and you do this, perhaps, to make it odious to our young priests; but you ought to know that it dates many centuries back, and that for many ages it has been received by our Church and practised by her ministers.

Salviano—Your law is not only a new thing, but I must tell you, moreover, that it is not a law at all, since a rule is no rule if it be not according to the Holy Gospel. Admitting that your law has been introduced into your Church as long ago as you please, by artifice and trickery, still it is new for all that. We have marriage granted by God to the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, and the pastors, during the course of many ages, and this marriage was taken away by you in the ages that came after. This alone would be sufficient to prove that the celibacy of priests is quite a new thing; but I am not satisfied with this, and will prove it to you more fully at our next meeting. At present, farewell.

(To be continued.)

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.—No. I.

THE following is one of the odd stories contained in that ancient and sufficiently curious compilation, the *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*. That we do not err in styling it *ancient*, appears from the fact, noticed by Mr. Petrie, in his learned essay on the Round Towers, &c., of Ireland, p. 158, that “no writer, however sceptical, has ever ventured to assign it to a later period than the tenth century.” Of the nature of its contents this story furnishes a not altogether uninteresting specimen:—

“Another time this holy man took his journey from Tarah to Usney Hill, with a view to building a Church there. But in this he met with opposition from the two sons of Niall, and brothers of King Laogaire, Fiach and Enda: to whom the man of God at first spake civilly, promising them that if they would allow the Church to be erected in honour of God, in that lovely spot, the moderators and rectors of that Church should be chosen from among their descendants. But when they not only refused to give heed to his preaching, and the benevolent proposal he made them, but were even taking steps to have him laid hands on, and removed by force from the place; then began the man of God, in righteous vengeance for such ill-usage, to let fly the dart of malediction against them and their posterity. And when, opening his mouth for this end, he had given utterance to the word *Cursed*, thereupon his disciple, S. Seachlin, taking out of his mouth the sentence he had commenced, completed it by adding the words, *be the stones of Usney Hill*. Well pleased was the man of God with the dutiful sympathy of his disciple, and the prayer that he expressed: and to the sentence thus pronounced he gave accordingly his ratification. Wonderful to tell, from that day to this, those stones, as though still subject to the influence of that curse, are found utterly unserviceable for building, or any other human purpose. So that it has become a proverbial expression, whenever stone, or other material, answers not the purpose for which it may be designed, to say—‘*Tis a stone from Usney Hill*.’”

What a ready-witted and good-natured Irishman was S. Seachlin, who, seeing his master tempted to indulge in the naughty habit of cursing his enemies, and bethinking himself, perhaps, that such was not the kind of prayers that St. Paul would have made for kings, and for all that are in authority (1 Tim. ii. 1, 4), at once administered such a respectful rebuke as came gracefully from a disciple, and, at the same time, interrupted the unholy prayer, and caused the malediction to turn aside from Fiach and Enda, and their unoffending posterity, to spend its poison on the senseless stones, just as the conductor, which diverts the lightning flash from doing injury to human life, and sends its fury away to consume itself in the bowels of the earth.

But no more about this at present. It is for a different purpose that we have quoted the story above told, our object being rather to direct the reader's attention to the terms of the agreement which Patrick proposed making with Fiach and Enda, in case they would allow him to build the Church at Usney Hill, as he desired to do. *The Church was to become the property of their family*, so as that none but their descendants should be its rectors or moderators. This kind of ecclesiastical arrangement, by which particular churches became the property of particular families, came afterwards into very general use in Ireland; and ecclesiastical benefices and offices descended from one member of a family to another, much in the same way as did secular landed property, according to the old Irish law or custom, known by the name of *Tanistry*.

To explain the custom intended by this term, for such readers as may not already be acquainted with it, we may remark, that according to it, on the death of any chief Lord or Captain among the Irish, there was usually elected in his stead, not the eldest son, nor any of the children of the lord deceased, but the next to him of blood that was eldest and worthiest of the office, in the estimation of the tribe; as commonly the next brother, or the next cousin, and so forth: and then, next to the one so chosen for chief, another similarly related to him was chosen to be *Tanist*, to succeed to the chieftainry, in case he should survive the one appointed to it. This mode of succession was considered to have an advantage over that of strict lineal descent from father to son, as affording a better protection to the lands and other rights of the tribe, which might be more easily encroached on if the father were to die leaving a minor to succeed to his office, during whose minority the neighbouring lords, and more especially the English, might seize their opportunity for invading the defenceless inheritance; whereas, by the Irish custom, if the chieftain fell in battle, his *Tanist*, already known, and one of years and ability, was ready to step immediately into his place. That the son should, however, in many instances, become the successor, though not, as a matter of course, nor according to general rule, was natural enough.—See *Spenser's View of the State of Ireland*, Dublin Edn. of 1809, pp. 10, 12.

Accordingly we find mention, in the Irish Annals, of *Tanist Abbots*, as well as of Secular *Tanists*, as of “Cormac, *Tanist Abbot of Clonmacnoise*,” at A.D. 887, of the *Four Masters*; “Dungal, son of Gorman, *Tanist Abbot of Clonmacnoise*,” at A.D. 1070, *ib.*; “Casey, son of Fergus, *Tanist Abbot of Armagh*,” at A.D. 892, of the same annals; and similar entries recur in various other places.

And that the *Tanist* of an ecclesiastical benefice was not merely a name given to the next successor expectant, canonically appointed, by election or otherwise, according to regular Church law, as upheld in other countries, might be evident even from this, that according to such law the successor to a benefice could not generally be appointed until the holder of it were deceased; so that the holder, while alive, could have no *Tanist*. But the same thing is still more apparent from examining, as we shall do presently, into the successions of officers connected with particular ecclesiastical establishments, and observing how the offices which they held were handed successively from one relative to another in the same tribe, through a course of many generations.

The offices which we have here particularly in view were those of *abbot*, or *coarb*, and *erenach*, or (according to the Irish spelling of the word) *archineach*; the former implying the chief place of command and influence in the old ecclesiastical corporations of Ireland; the latter, the holding of the temporalities belonging to the establishment. The *bishop's* office, among the ancient Irish, was attended with less of authority and emolument, although otherwise held in much veneration, and regarded as proper to be occupied only by men of eminent spiritual attainments.

In illustration of the remarks above advanced, we shall exhibit, from the Ancient Irish Annals, various instances in which the same ecclesiastical office, that had been held by a father, descended in course of time to his son (the son not always or naturally being the next successor, but coming in after, perhaps, an uncle, a cousin, &c.), or in which different ecclesiastical offices, about the same place (or in places having some particular connection with one another), came to be filled, from generation to generation, by members in lineal descent of the same family.

The most remarkable case of this kind which occurs in our ancient Annals appears to be that of the Mac Connemoghts (or more properly Mac Chuinn-na-mochts), of Clonmacnoise, whose history, so far as we are particularly acquainted or concerned with it, commences in the middle of the eighth century, and, from that period onwards, occupies for three centuries and a half a distinguished and interesting place in the ecclesiastical records of Ireland. In tracing the history in question we shall, for the satisfaction of our readers (many of whom, it is to be hoped, can read Irish well), give the passages quoted from the Irish Annals in the original language, with a correct translation into English, in parallel columns. The extracts underneath are all from the “*Four Masters*,” in whose work, by a reference to the proper year, each of them may easily be found:—

A. C. 753. *Ḵormān, comarba Mochta Luimnāiḡ, dēcc i cCluain mċ Nōir, iḡa aīl-īrē, 7 ba heīrīde aīarī Tōrbāiḡ, comarba Padraīcc.*

A. C. 807 [recte 812]. *Tōrbach, mac Ḵormān, rēuīrīb, leḡōīr, 7 abb Aīda Māca ēīrīde [dēcc]. Oo Chevel Tōrbāiḡ, i. O Ceallāiḡ Breāiḡ, 7 nō ba dībhīrīde Conn nā mboīc nō baī hī cCluain mċ Nōir, 7 ar aīre aībeīrīc Conn nā mboīc ēīrīr, ar a mēd dō boīcāiḡ nō bīaīcādh dō ḡīrē.*

A. C. 753. GORMAN, coarb of Mochta of Louth [i.e., Abbot of Louth], died at Clonmacnoise, on his pilgrimage; and it was he that was father of *Torbach*, coarb of Patrick [i.e., Prelate of Armagh].

A. C. 807 [properly 812]. TORBACH, son of Gorman, scribe, lector, and Abbot of Armagh was he, died. Of the kindred of Torbach, i.e.—the O'Kelly Breagh [tribe]; and of these was [also] Conn-na-mbocht, who was at Clonmacnoise, and received the name of Conn-na-mbocht [Conn of the paupers], from the number of paupers he constantly supported.